

1 JEFFREY S. BUCHOLTZ  
2 Acting Assistant Attorney General  
3 SCOTT N. SCHOOLS  
4 United States Attorney  
5 CARL J. NICHOLS  
6 Deputy Assistant Attorney General  
7 JOSEPH H. HUNT  
8 Director, Federal Programs Branch  
9 VINCENT M. GARVEY  
10 Deputy Director, Federal Programs Branch  
11 MICHAEL P. ABATE  
12 Trial Attorney  
13 michael.abate@usdoj.gov  
14 U.S. Department of Justice  
15 Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch  
16 20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW  
17 Washington, DC 20001  
18 Phone: (202) 616-8209  
19 Fax: (202) 616-8470  
20 Attorneys for the United States of America

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
San Jose Division

BINYAM MOHAMED;  
ABOU ELKASSIM BRITEL;  
AHMED AGIZA;  
MOHAMED FARAG AHMAD  
BASHMILAH;  
BISHER AL-RAWI

Case No. C-07-02798-JW

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND  
MOTION TO INTERVENE**

JEPPESEN DATAPLAN, INC.

Judge: Hon. James Ware  
Hearing Date: February 4, 2008  
Hearing Time: 9:00 AM  
Courtroom: 8, 4th Floor

Defendant.

United States' Notice of Motion and  
Motion to Intervene, Case No. C-07-02798-JW

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO INTERVENE**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, on February 4, 2008, before the Honorable James Ware, intervenor United States of America will move and hereby does move, pursuant to Rule 24(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, for an order allowing the United States to intervene in this action for the purpose of seeking dismissal. The grounds in support of this motion are set out in the United States' memorandum below.

## **MEMORANDUM OF SUPPORTING POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

## **INTRODUCTION**

Plaintiffs bring this action under the Alien Tort Statute, 28 U.S.C. 1330 (“ATS”), alleging that agents of the United States and foreign governments, with the assistance of defendant Jeppesen Dataplan Inc., subjected them to “forced disappearance, torture, and inhumane treatment” as part of the Central Intelligence Agency’s “so-called ‘extraordinary rendition’ program.” First Amended Compl. ¶¶ 1-2. Through the present motion, the United States seeks to intervene in this action, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(a), for the purpose of seeking dismissal of this action. For the reasons set forth below, the United States clearly meets all the requirements for intervention under Rule 24(a): (1) its application for intervention is timely; (2) the United States has a significantly protectable interest relating to the subject matter of this action, *i.e.*, the preservation of state secrets, as set forth in its separate assertion of the military and state secrets privilege, and the protection of information covered by a statutory privilege; (3) the United States needs to intervene because this action challenges alleged Central Intelligence Agency (“CIA”) clandestine intelligence activities; and (4) no other party in this lawsuit could adequately represent the United States’ interest. Accordingly, the United States’ motion to intervene should be granted.

## **PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS AGAINST JEPPESEN**

Each of the five plaintiffs in this action alleges that he was arrested, transported, detained, and interrogated as part of the CIA’s terrorist detention and interrogation program. Plaintiffs contend that they were subject to “forced disappearance, torture, and inhumane treatment . . . by agents of the

1 United States and other governments.” First Amended Compl. ¶ 1. Plaintiffs further allege that  
2 defendant Jeppesen “provided direct and substantial services to the United States for its so-called  
3 ‘extraordinary rendition’ program, enabling the clandestine and forcible transportation of terrorism  
4 suspects to secret overseas detention facilities where they were placed beyond the reach of the law  
5 and subjected to torture and other forms of cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment.” *Id.* ¶ 2.

6 The First Amended Complaint contains two discrete claims for relief. Each arises under the  
7 Alien Tort Statute (“ATS”), 28 U.S.C. § 1330, which states that “[t]he district courts shall have  
8 original jurisdiction of any civil action by an alien for a tort only, committed in violation of the law  
9 of nations or a treaty of the United States.”

10 The first ATS claim alleges that Jeppesen is liable for Plaintiffs’ forced disappearance.  
11 Plaintiffs contend that Jeppesen is “directly liable” for this alleged violation of international law,  
12 because it “actively participated in numerous aspects of the logistical planning and implementation  
13 of the extraordinary renditions of Plaintiffs, with actual or constructive knowledge that its  
14 involvement would result in the secret apprehension and detention of Plaintiffs.” First Amended  
15 Compl. ¶ 254. In addition, or in the alternative, Plaintiffs also assert that Jeppesen is liable under  
16 the ATS because it “conspired with agents of the United States in Plaintiffs’ forced disappearance,”  
17 because it “aided and abetted agents of the United States, Morocco, Egypt and Jordan in subjecting  
18 Plaintiffs to such treatment,” and/or because it “demonstrated reckless disregard as to whether  
19 Plaintiffs would be subject to forced disappearance.” *Id.* ¶ 255-57.

20 The second ATS claim alleges that Jeppesen is liable for Plaintiffs’ alleged “torture and other  
21 cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment by agents of the United States, Morocco, and Egypt.” *Id.* ¶  
22 260. Unlike the first count, this claim does not allege that Jeppesen is directly liable for the alleged  
23 tort. Instead, it relies on the same indirect theories of liability that were advanced as alternative bases  
24 of liability in the first claim: namely, that Jeppesen “conspired with agents of the United States in  
25 Plaintiffs’ torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment, including their rendition to  
26 Morocco, Egypt, and Afghanistan,” that it “aided and abetted agents of the United States, Morocco  
27

1 and Egypt in subjecting Plaintiffs to such treatment,” and/or that it “demonstrated a reckless  
 2 disregard as to whether Plaintiffs would be subjected to torture or other cruel, inhuman, or degrading  
 3 treatment by providing flight and logistical support to aircraft and crew it knew or reasonably should  
 4 have known would be used in the extraordinary rendition program.” *Id.* ¶¶ 262-64.

5 **ARGUMENT**

6 **THE UNITED STATES IS ENTITLED TO INTERVENE AS A MATTER OF RIGHT**

7 Rule 24(a) provides:

8 Upon timely application anyone shall be permitted to intervene in an action: (1) when  
 9 a statute of the United States confers an unconditional right to intervene; or (2) when  
 10 the applicant claims an interest relating to the property or transaction which is the  
 11 subject of the action and the applicant is so situated that the disposition of the action  
 12 may as a practical matter impair or impede the applicant’s ability to protect that  
 13 interest, unless the applicant’s interest is adequately represented by existing parties.

14 Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a). A potential intervenor must meet four requirements to satisfy Rule 24(a): “(1)  
 15 the application for intervention must be timely; (2) the applicant must have a ‘significantly  
 16 protectable’ interest relating to the property or transaction that is the subject of the action; (3) the  
 17 applicant must be so situated that the disposition of the action may, as a practical matter, impair or  
 18 impede the applicant’s ability to protect that interest; and (4) the applicant’s interest must not be  
 19 adequately represented by the existing parties in the lawsuit.” *Southwest Ctr. for Biological*  
*Diversity v. Berg*, 268 F.3d 810, 817 (9th Cir. 2001) (citing *Northwest Forest Resource Council v.*  
*Glickman*, 82 F.3d 825, 836 (9th Cir. 1996)). The Ninth Circuit generally construes Rule 24(a)  
 20 liberally in favor of potential intervenors. *Southwest Ctr. for Biological Diversity*, 268 F.3d at 818;  
 21 *see also United States v. Alisal Water Corp.*, 370 F.3d 915, 919 (9th Cir. 2004) (“[T]he requirements  
 22 for intervention are broadly interpreted in favor of intervention”). The United States clearly meets  
 23 all the standards for intervention.

24 First, there should be no question that the Government’s motion to intervene is timely within  
 25 the meaning of Rule 24. “In determining whether a motion for intervention is timely, we consider  
 26 three factors: ‘(1) the stage of the proceeding at which an applicant seeks to intervene; (2) the  
 27 prejudice to other parties; and (3) the reason for and length of the delay.’ *League of United Latin*

1 *American Citizens v. Wilson*, 131 F.3d 1297, 1302 (9th Cir. 1997) (quoting *County of Orange v. Air*  
2 *California*, 799 F.2d 535, 537 (9th Cir. 1986)). This case is only in its initial stages. Plaintiffs filed  
3 their First Amended Complaint on August 1, 2007. *See* Docket No. 27. On August 7, 2007, the  
4 parties stipulated that defendant should have until September 19, 2007 to respond to that First  
5 Amended Complaint. On September 6, 2007, the United States filed a Statement of Interest  
6 informing this Court that it was considering whether, and if so, how, it would participate in this  
7 action, including whether it would assert the state secrets privilege. *See* Docket No. 34. The United  
8 States further informed this Court that it would make that determination, and file any motions, by  
9 October 19, 2007. *Id.* In light of that Statement of Interest, defendant filed a Motion for Extension  
10 of Time to File its Answer. *See* Docket No. 35. On September 11, 2007, this Court granted  
11 defendant's Motion, deferring its duty to answer until the later of: (a) ten (10) days after the Court  
12 enters an order disposing of any motion to dismiss that may be filed by the United States in this  
13 action; or (b) November 2, 2007. *See* Docket No. 41. Because no dispositive motions have been  
14 filed in this case, and no hearings are currently scheduled, there can be no dispute that this motion  
15 is timely.

16 Second, the United States clearly has an interest relating to the subject matter of this action.  
17 This case involves allegations concerning clandestine intelligence activities allegedly conducted by  
18 the Central Intelligence Agency. The United States has asserted the state secrets privilege and  
19 statutory privileges in this matter, and is hereby moving to intervene for the purpose of moving to  
20 dismiss or, in the alternative, for summary judgment. Because the lawsuit challenges alleged  
21 intelligence activities of the United States and because the United States has asserted the state secrets  
22 privilege and a statutory privilege over information at issue, the Government's interest satisfies  
23 requirements of Rule 24(a).

24 Third, for these very reasons--that the lawsuit challenges alleged activities of the United  
25 States and that the United States has asserted the state secrets privilege and statutory privileges--the  
26 United States is simultaneously seeking dismissal or, in the alternative, summary judgment. It is  
27

1 appropriate to permit the United States to intervene to seek such dismissal. *See Zuckerbraun v.*  
 2 *General Dynamics Corp.*, 935 F.2d 544, 546-48 (2d Cir. 1991) (United States intervened and  
 3 successfully sought dismissal of the action based on the assertion of the state secrets privilege);  
 4 *Fitzgerald v. Penthouse Int'l, Ltd.*, 77 F.2d 1236, 1239 (4th Cir. 1985) (court allowed intervention  
 5 where United States had a national interest in proceedings); *see also Kasza v. Browner*, 133 F.3d  
 6 1159, 1166 (9th Cir. 1998) (“if the very subject matter of the action’ is a state secret, then the court  
 7 should dismiss the plaintiff’s action based solely on the invocation of the state secrets privilege”)  
 8 (quoting *United States v. Reynolds*, 345 U.S. 1, 11 n. 26 (1953)).

9 Finally, the United States’ interest is not adequately represented by the parties to the  
 10 litigation. In determining whether a potential intervenor’s interests will be adequately represented  
 11 by an existing party, courts consider: “(1) whether the interest of a present party is such that it will  
 12 undoubtedly make all the intervenor’s arguments; (2) whether the present party is capable and  
 13 willing to make such arguments; and (3) whether the would-be intervenor would offer any necessary  
 14 elements to the proceedings that other parties would neglect.” *Southwest Ctr. for Biological*  
 15 *Diversity*, 268 F.3d at 822. The intervenor’s burden of showing that the existing parties may not  
 16 adequately represent its interest is “minimal,” and the potential intervenor “need only show that  
 17 representation of its interests by existing parties ‘may be’ inadequate.” *Id.* at 822-23 (citing *Trbovich*  
 18 *v. United Mine Workers*, 404 U.S. 528, 538 n. 10 (1972)). The court’s focus should be on the  
 19 “subject of the action.” *Southwest Center for Biological Diversity*, 268 F.3d at 823 (citation  
 20 omitted). None of the parties has either the obligation or the ability to assert the state secrets  
 21 privilege or specified statutory privilege in this litigation. The privilege belongs to the Government  
 22 alone and cannot be asserted by private citizens. *See Reynolds*, 345 U.S. at 7-8 (state secrets privilege  
 23 must be asserted by head of department which has control over the information at issue).

24 Indeed, the parties are not aware of the breadth of the information covered by the privilege  
 25 assertions, and because information covered by the privilege is classified, they would, in any event,  
 26 be unable to present the issues to the Court effectively and properly. Moreover, the parties’ interest  
 27

1 may well be in the *disclosure* of state secrets to the extent that doing so might assist them in  
 2 presenting their claims or defenses fully to vindicate their own private interests. Thus, only the  
 3 United States is in a position to protect against the disclosure of information over which it has  
 4 asserted the state secrets privilege, and the United States is the only entity properly positioned to  
 5 explain to the Court why continued litigation of the matter threatens the national security.  
 6 Accordingly, the United States should be permitted to intervene for the purpose of moving to dismiss  
 7 this action on state secrets privilege grounds.

8 Having satisfied the requirements of Rule 24(a), the United States should be allowed to  
 9 intervene as of right.<sup>1</sup>

10 **CONCLUSION**

11 Accordingly, the United States respectfully requests that the Court grant its motion to  
 12 intervene pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a).

13 Respectfully Submitted,

14 JEFFREY S. BUCHOLTZ  
 15 Acting Assistant Attorney General

16 SCOTT N. SCHOOLS  
 17 United States Attorney

18 CARL J. NICHOLS  
 19 Deputy Assistant Attorney General

20 JOSEPH H. HUNT  
 21 Director, Federal Programs Branch

22 VINCENT M. GARVEY  
 23 Deputy Director, Federal Programs Branch

24 /s/ Michael. P. Abate  
 25 MICHAEL P. ABATE  
 26 Trial Attorney  
 27 michael.abate@usdoj.gov

---

28 <sup>1</sup> In the alternative, Rule 24(b) allows for permissive intervention where the motion is timely,  
 29 the party has an interest in the litigation, and there is no undue delay or prejudice to the parties in  
 30 allowing the intervention. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b). As the discussion above demonstrates, the  
 31 Government has met these standards for permissive intervention.

1 U.S. Department of Justice  
2 Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch  
3 20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW  
4 Washington, DC 20001  
Phone: (202) 616-8209  
Fax: (202) 616-8470

5 *Attorneys for the United States of America*

6 Dated: October 19, 2007

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that the foregoing NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO INTERVENE will be served by means of the Court's CM/ECF system, which will send notifications of such filing to the following:

American Civil Liberties Union  
Foundation of Northern California Inc.  
Ann Brick  
39 Drumm Street  
San Francisco, CA 94111

American Civil Liberties Union  
Jameel Jaffer  
Steven R Shapiro  
Steven M. Watt  
Benjamin Elihu Wizner  
125 Broad Street  
18th Floor  
New York, NY 10004

International Human Rights Clinic  
Washington Square Legal Services, Inc.  
Margaret L. Satterthwaite  
NYU School of Law  
245 Sullivan Street  
New York, NY 10012

Joseph Scott Klapach  
Attorney at Law  
355 S. Grand Ave., #3500  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560

Munger Tolles & Olson  
Daniel Paul Collins  
Henry Weissman  
355 So Grand Ave Ste 3500  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560

National Litigation Project-Allard K. Lowenstein  
International Human Rights Clinic  
Hope R Metcalf  
Yale Law School  
127 Wall Street  
New Haven, CT 06520

United States' Notice of Motion and  
Motion to Intervene, Case No. C-07-02798-JW

1 Reprieve  
2 Zachary Philip Katzenelson  
3 Clive Stafford Smith  
4 PO Box 52742  
5 London, England, UK EC4P 4WS

6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

/s/ Michael P. Abate

United States' Notice of Motion and  
Motion to Intervene, Case No. C-07-02798-JW